

frank denninger
<gladesman@gmail.com>

04/26/2010 07:27 PM

To Damon Doumlele <Damon_Doumlele@nps.gov>

cc

Subject Re: Comment to ORV committee members and the
committee web site.

Damon,

Please discard the previous comment submitted and replace with this replacement.

Thanks,

Frank Denninger

On 4/26/10, **frank denninger** <gladesman@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Committee Members,

At the April 20, 2010 ORV committee meeting a discussion took place regarding the future content of minutes generated from the meetings that was not on the agenda. Issue #1 being provision of anonymity for speakers (committee members for sure - don't recall mention of it applying to public speakers) at these meetings and issue #2 being depth of detail captured by these minutes.

Comment to Issue #1

It seemed to me that there was consensus among committee members unable to ponder the subject ahead of time to accept both ideas. This was very worrisome to me. I strongly disagree that any committee member or meeting attendee would have anonymity bestowed upon them by the adjusted minutes protocol proposed. Mention was made by the facilitator that this would somehow enhance the transparency.. It is my opinion that only the exact opposite (100%opacity) would occur. I would think everyone who utters a word at these meetings would be proud to have their name associated with their statement. These minutes will be the only public record of this committee's work (since the tape recordings are only used to facilitate minutes production) and whomever reviews that public record in the near or long term has a right to know who said what regarding all subject matter before this committee. The record of who said what could assist NPS in building bridges between differing perspectives inevitably in my opinion.

My suggestion is that names of any and all speakers be documented in relation to what they say each time they speak on the record at all of these Big Cypress National Preserve, FACA ORV Advisory Committee meetings.

Comment to Issue #2

The degree of detail supplied in the minutes of these meetings to date has been outstanding. I hate to see this level of detail reduced but can understand that if it must happen. I'm sure it consumes an immense amount of staff time. I would request that this level of detail be retained for the more complicated subjects so that these minutes might assist others in their future attempts to resolve similar issues around the nation. We are told that many people are watching what is happening here in the Big Cypress Nat'l. Preserve. Our minutes could be the guidebook to conflict resolution that many need badly.

New Comment Subject:

There was a lengthy discussion related to ORV visitors being allowed to set up campsites adjacent to designated primary and secondary trails. My perception is that the committee members were very receptive of the concept and each others ideas on what I thought would be more difficult subject to reach agreement on. After the committee had discussed the concept chief ranger Ed Clark took the podium to address the group in attendance. My interpretation of what he said is that to enable the enforcement staff to do their job properly that a somewhat tighter structure than what the committee gravitated to would be necessary. I apologize for not remembering the details on Mr Clark's comments but I believe he was having a problem with the concept of camping in random/unspecified sites along the trails or at the hypothetical distance of 100 yards/300 feet from a trail centerline.

I think it would be wise prior to the next meeting (June 22, 2010) for the committee to request chief ranger Ed Clark to present possibly an outline of a minimum enforcement structure that rangers would require to be able to enforce ORV camping within a camping corridor in a consistent and fair manner.

This would provide the committee an opportunity to thoroughly flesh out Mr Clark's presentation at the next meeting.

Thanks for Reading,

Frank F. Denninger